(b) The percentages of the procurement charges and distribution cost to the procurement price are given for the above period as under:—

Rate Rs./per quinta

	1982-83		1983-84		1983-84 (BE)		1985-86 (BE)	
	Rate	%over proc. price	Rate	%over proc. price	Rate	%over proc. price	Rate	%over proc. price
(i) *Wheat (Indigenous)*								
Procurement price	142·00	100	151·00	100	152·00	100	157·00	100
Procurement charges.	24·28	17·09	24·17	16·00	28·09	18·48	28·11	17·90
Distribution Cost.	43·91	30·92	46·87	31·04	48·34	31·80	49·18	31·32
(ii) *Rice (Indigenous)*								
Average Procurement Price	209·55	100	226·07	100	238·61	100	238·61	10
Procurement Charges	9·94	4·74	11·11	4·91	17·57	7·36	17·57	7·36
Distribution Cost	43·91	20·95	46·37	20·73	48·34	20·25	49·18	20·61

(c) The trade of foodgrains is already in the Private Sector, However, Food Corporation of India issues foodgrains for distribution to Public Distribution System for making this available at reasonable prices to consumers, particularly to weaker section. The Government constantly monitors the performance of the Food Corporation of India with a view to bringing economy and efficiency in its operations.

Various poverty alleviation schemes of Integrated Rural Development Programme

1983. SHRI PYARELAL KHANDELWAL :
SHRI SHANKER SINH VAGHELA:
SHRI ASHWANI KUMAR:
SHRI K. VASUDEVA PANICKER :

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have undertaken on sample basis evaluation of various poverty alleviation schemes of the Integrated Rurl Development Programme; and

(b) if so, what are the Statewise findings?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI CHANDULAL CHANDRAKAR): (a) and (b) The Department of Rural Development has commissioned some studies for evaluating the Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP).

2. The Programme Evaluation Organisation (PEO) of the planning Commission has recently completed a study of IRDP. The study covered a sample of 1170 beneficiary households from 66 blocks in 33 districts spread over 16 States. The names of the States and districts are given

in the attached Statement. Following are, in brief, major findings on various schemes:—

(i) 75 per cent were provided with primary sector schemes, 8 per cent secondary sector schemes and nearly 17 per cent tertiary sector schemes. Within the primary secto 44 per cent of the total sample households were provided with animal husbandry schemes, mostly milch cattle, a little above 28 per cent were benefited through agricutural schemes, chiefly relating to irrigation works and about 3% through subsidiary occupation schemes.

(ii) The average amount of financial assistance provided per benefit scheme under the primary sector came to Rs. 3,457 under the secondary sector to Rs. 1,390 and was Rs. 2,175 for tertiary sector schemes.

(iii) The highest percentage increase in income was in respect of the sample households benefited through tertiary sectoral scheme (63%). The increase in the income of the sample households provided with primary sectoral schemes was of the order of 44% and for beneficiaries provided with secondary sectoral schemes 42%.

(iv) The incremental investment income ratio for tertiary sectoral schemes is distinctly and significantly favourable compared to all the other categories of schemes relative to the primary sectoral schemes the incremental investment income ratio in the secondary sectoral schemes also comes out to be markedly favourable.

(v) The subsidy-credit-ratio for the primary sector schemes worked out at 1:2·07, 1:1·84 for secondary sector schemes and 1:1·95 for tertiary sector schemes.

3. To evaluate the impact o- milch animal schemes, a study wa commissioned in district Sabarkantha of Gujarat State. The study has been conducted by the Insittute of Rural Management, Anand. The study covered a sample of 244 beneficiary households and 74 non-beneficiaries from Idar and Khedbrahma blocks.

Following are, in brief, the major findings of the study:—

(1) the average milk production per IRDP milk animal per lactation was significantly higher for the beneficiaries than for the non-beneficiaries.

(2) The programme seems to have induced use of higher quantities of concentrate feed and veterinary medicines by the beneficiaries than by their counterpart non-beneficiaries in both the blocks.

(3) The average quantities of milk sold, and milk retained for consumption, average price realised and average gross revenue from sale of milk were higher for the beneficiary households than for the non-beneficiary households.

(4) The per litre cost of production of milk in the case of beneficiary was higher because of better feeding of good quality animals.

(5) The programme has a substantial positive impact on both the average total family income at both the current and the constant prices as well as the income from milk in both the blocks.

4. Another study conducted by the National Institute of Urban Affairs, New Delhi, in district Alleppey (Kerala State) and Sambalpur (Orissa State) in 1982, *inter-alia*, pointed out that wherever beneficiaries had been given assistance in

the form of Load Boats, Handcart, Mosaic Polishing Machines, Laundry Equipment, Band Instruments, Bakery, Soda Factory, Mike Sets, etc. the beneficiaries are generally happy. Most of these items of assistance have been given only in Alleppey. Such diversified types of assistance deserve to be tried in Sambalpur also.

Statement

The names of the States and Districts covered by the PEO study

Sl. No.	State	District
1	Madhya Pradesh	Jhabua, Bastar, Damoh, Betul
2	Orissa	Koraput, Sundergarh
3	Jammu & Kashmir	Jammu, Anantnag
4	West Bengal	Darjeeling
5	Tamil Nadu	Kanya Kumari, Madurai
6	Haryana	Karnal, Jind
7	Andhra Pradesh	Guntur, Vizianagaram
8	Punjab	Ferozepur, Sangrur
9	Uttar Pradesh	Sultanpur, Mirzapur
10	Maharashtra	Osmanabad, Thane
11	Rajasthan	Bikaner, Jodhpur
12	Gujarat	Kheda, Rajkot
13	Kerala	Cannanore, Quilon
14	Karnataka	Uttar Kannada, Mysore
15	Bihar	Samastipur, Palamau
16	Himachal Pradesh	Una, Kullu

Distribution of surplus land

1984. SHRI KAILASH PATI MISHRA:
SHRI SHANKER SINH VAGHELA:
SHRI ASHWAN KUMAR:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state :

(a) what are the targets for different States and Union Territories in regard to distribution of the land in excess of land ceiling under the 20-point programme and what was the area of land found in excess of land-ceiling in each of the State/Union Territories, out of it what was the area of land acquired, the area of land distributed and the area of land for which ownership has been given to the allottees; and

(b) what has been the impact of shortfall in the achievement of the targets regarding provision of land ownership to the poor on the achievements of various programmes and projects relating to removal of poverty